

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 12, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (US 6,138,106) in view of Pennell et al. (US 6,910,179).
Regarding claims 1 and 10, Walker et al. discloses an on-line selling system comprising:

A sale processing system storing a first selling program, said first selling program defining a first process of selecting and buying, for enabling a user's terminal to engage with said sale processing system for selecting and buying (column 2, lines 47-51 and column 8, lines 39-43 and column 9, lines 39-43, 60-64).

Said sale processing system including a Web site via which the user's terminal is capable of engaging the first selling program and placing a first order (column 6, lines 27-30).

The sale processing system being capable of accepting the first order performing a sale price settlement associated with the first order, and processing delivery of the first order (column 9, lines 60-65 and column 10, lines 63-65).

A goods supply system that supplies an item of goods to the sale processing system

(column 9, lines 5-8).

The goods supply system includes a program-providing device, the program-providing device providing a second selling program to the sale processing system, the second selling program defining a second process of selecting and buying the item of goods from the goods supply system (column 9, lines 64-67 and column 10, lines 1-10).

The second selling program causes the user's terminal that has accessed the Web site to display on a monitor thereof the second process of selecting and buying the item of goods supply system (column 4, lines 1-5 and column 10, lines 39-41).

The second selling program causes the user's terminal to transmit a second order for the item of goods bought through the second process displayed on the user's terminal to the sale processing system (column 10, lines 6-10).

The second selling program being written in a www script language and being provided from the Web site to the user's terminal to thereby be executed on the user's terminal in association with a Web browsing program (column 4, lines 1-5).

What Walker et al. does not disclose is that the second buying process is different from the first buying process.

However, Pennell et al. teaches (column 2, line 61 to column 3, line 37) a second buying process which is different from the first process in that the system can be "smarter" in how forms are filled out for orders in order to save the customer time.

Special note to column 3, line 34 where code is received from the visited web site.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the on-line selling system disclosed by Walker et al. to have a second buying process different from the first process in order to save the customer time.

Regarding claims 3 and 12, Walker et al. discloses an on-line selling system wherein the second selling program is configured to execute a prescribed piece of lot-drawing processing to thereby determine an-the item of goods to be sold to the user (column 7, lines 21-23 and column 9, lines 5-8).

Regarding claims 4 and 13, Walker et al. discloses an on-line selling system wherein the Web site is capable of causing the user's terminal that has made access thereto to display on the monitor thereof a Web page containing therein a prescribed image associated with execution of the second selling program and the second selling program is executed in response to a user's selecting operation performed with respect to the prescribed image (column 10, lines 6-10, 22-25, 39-41).

Regarding claims 6 and 15, Walker et al. discloses an on-line selling system wherein the program-providing device is capable of transmitting the second selling program to a client included in the sale processing system (column 10, lines 39-44).

2. Claims 5 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. ('106) and Pennell et al. ('179), as applied above) in further view of Satchell et al. (US 5,822,216).

The combination system of Walker et al. and Pennell et al. does not disclose a vending machine interface.

However, Satchell et al. teaches that it is known to combine the features of a vending machine with an internet connection to provide an on-line selling system that "provides entertainment" (column 2, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination on-line selling system disclosed by Walker et al. and Pennell et al. to combine a vending machine interface with an internet connection, as taught by Satchell et al., to provide an on-line selling system that "provides entertainment" to an on-line buyer (column 2, lines 8-10).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/24/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's amendment re-writes what claim language had already existed so the prior art rejection has not been altered.

Applicant argues that the prior art can not prepare by another system for each input form. The examiner does not concur. The examiner is not sure if that limitation is even positively recited. However, the Pennell reference teaches that the input form

could be prepared by either browser automation 302 or 305, thus meeting the claim language. Further, in this day of computer networks and under the guidelines of KSR, the mere processing of data in one area of the network instead of another would be obvious.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cuff whose telephone number is (571) 272-6778. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Cuff/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 362739